I-CHING ON THE SANSKRIT GRAMMARIANS

By JOHN BROUGH

Since 1896, when I-ching's famous book on Buddhism in India and South East Asia was made available in an English translation by J. Takakusu,[1] Western Sanskritists have looked with special interest at chapter xxxiv, on the Sanskrit grammarians. The general reaction has been one of disappointment; and for many years most Indologists would have agreed with many of A. Barth's [2] criticisms: 'Il demeure donc bien acquis que, parmi des renseignements du plus grand prix, comme les dates de la *Kāçikā Vṛitti* et du grammairien Bhartṛihari, I-tsing nous a servi quelques bourdes énormes; par exemple, quand il fait du *Mahābhāshya* un commentaire sur la *Kāçikā Vṛitti*; quand il distingue entre le *Vākyapadīya* de Bhartṛihari et son commentaire sur le *Mahābhāshya*'; and more besides. Ironically, it is now known that the date given for Bhartṛhari is wrong, and that the latter did write both the *Vākyapadīya* and a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*.[3] Nevertheless, other errors continue to be quoted.

The present article is prompted by the publication in 1966 of a photographic reprint of Takakusu's translation, without modification. My intention is to attempt a reassessment of the general structure of the chapter (though many obscurities in points of detail remain unsolved): to indicate some places where

[1] Principal references

T *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō.*

I-ching: *Nan-hai chi-kuei nei-fa chuan* 南海寄歸內法傳, *T*, LIV, no. 2125.

J. Takakusu [Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎] (transl.), *A record of the Buddhist religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago* (*A.D. 671–695*), *by I-tsing*, London, 1896; reprinted Delhi, 1966.

Ono Gemmyō 小野玄妙 (Japanese transl.), in *Kokuyaku Issaikyō*, LXXXIV, *Shiden-bu* 史傳部, part 16, Tokyo, 1936, reprinted 1959.

Hsüan-tsang: *Ta T'ang hsi-yü chi* 大唐西域記 *T*, LI, no. 2087.

S. Beal (transl.), *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist records of the western world . . . from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang*, London, 1884; reprinted Delhi, 1969.

'Biography': *Ta T'ang Ta tz'ŭ-en ssŭ san-tsang fa-shih chuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, by Hui-li 慧立 and Yen-ts'ung 彥悰, *T*, L, no. 2053.

Stanislas Julien (transl.), *Voyages des pèlerins bouddhistes*, I, *Histoire de la vie de Hiouen-thsang et de ses voyages dans l'Inde*, Paris, 1853.

S. Beal (transl.), *The life of Hiuen-Tsiang*, London, 1888, reprinted 1911, 1914.

In the transcription of Middle Chinese, I have tried to follow in principle E. G. Pulleyblank, 'The consonantal system of Old Chinese', *AM*, NS, IX, 1, 1962, 58–144; IX, 2, 1963, 206–65. On the principle of economy, I have omitted the *yod* where it is implicit in the syllable, i.e., where no contrasting form without *yod* can exist. Oversight apart, other departures from Pulleyblank's notation are purely typographical, and self-explanatory.

[2] In his review-article on Takakusu's translation, *Journal des Savants*, sept. 1898, 532.

[3] On this, see also p. 259, n. 40, below.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

difficulties are due to I-ching's admittedly superficial knowledge, and a few others where they are due to the inadequacy [4] of the English translation.

I. ' The Si-t'an-chang (Siddha-composition) for Beginners ' [5]

The *Siddham* (the Sanskrit syllabary) requires little comment.[6] Since the number of simple characters 字 is given as 49, this is a normal *varṇa-samāmnāya*, and Takakusu is mistaken when he writes in a footnote (p. 171), ' I-tsing may be referring to the Śiva-sūtra ', since the latter contains only 43 elements. I-ching himself seems to have made the same confusion, since he states a few sentences later that the *Siddham* is said to have been taught originally by the god Maheśvara. Hsüan-tsang, on the other hand, ascribes the origin of Indian writing to the god Brahmā 梵 天, and gives the number of simple characters 言 as 47.[7] The extent of the total work, including conjunct characters, is said by I-ching to be more than 300 *ślokas* 頌.[8] This must then be a similar book to the one mentioned, without name, in the ' Biography ' of Hsüan-tsang,[9] as treating of the forms of characters, *tzŭ-t'i* 字 體, in 300 *ślokas*.

Apart from this item, the remaining Sanskrit grammatical texts dealt with are in the Pāṇinean tradition.

II. ' The Sūtra '

This is correctly attributed to Pāṇini, ' who is said to have been inspired and assisted by Maheśvara-deva, and endowed with three eyes ': 爲 大 自 在 天 之 所 加 被。面 現 三 目. Unless some Indian tradition has escaped my attention, Pāṇini is not credited with triple vision, while the three eyes of Śiva are well known. It is therefore tempting to understand the last phrase quoted, ' His face displays three eyes ', as referring to Śiva. But it is difficult to reconcile this with the Chinese (unless we postulate a marginal gloss, subsequently misplaced in the text); and the slight surprise implied by the

[4] This is not said to discredit the work as a whole, which was of great value at the time; and it must also be remembered that this translation was a very early work of the distinguished Japanese scholar who, during the remainder of a long life, contributed so much to Buddhist studies.

[5] Section headings (which are in the original) are printed here as in Takakusu's book, except that for typographical convenience I have throughout modernized his transliteration of Sanskrit words.

[6] R. H. van Gulik, *Siddham*, Nagpur, 1956; and most recently, Gadjin M. Nagao, ' Siddham and its study in Japan ', *Acta Asiatica* (Tokyo), 21, 1971, 1–12.

[7] *Hsi-yü chi*, *T*, LI, 876 *c*.

[8] The term *sung* 頌 is conveniently used to translate *śloka* in both senses of the Sanskrit word, ' metrical stanza ', and ' a length of 32 syllables ' (in measuring the total extent of a prose work). I-ching, however, appears to have found it difficult to disentangle these two senses: a *sung*, he says, consists of four phrases, *chü* 句 (*pāda*), each of eight syllables, *tzŭ* 字, thus giving a total of 32 syllables, *yen* 言. This, with his statement that there are also long and short *ślokas*, shows that he was thinking in terms of stanzas (Takakusu, 171–2; *T*, LIV, 228 *b*). Hsüan-tsang, on the other hand, explains in one brief sentence that a *sung* consists of 32 syllables, *yen* (*T*, LI, 881 *c*).

[9] *T*, L, 239 *a*.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

following sentence, ' This is generally believed by Indians today ' 時人方信, suggests that I-ching misunderstood his Indian informants, and that Takakusu's rendering is a reasonable paraphrase.

Note that the name of Pāṇini's grammar is not mentioned.

III. ' The Book on Dhātu '

' This . . . treats particularly of grammatical roots ': 專明字元; but perhaps rather, ' exclusively explains (verbal) roots '. This, as Takakusu recognized, must be the *Dhātu-pāṭha*, which does explain each root by adding its meaning. But this identification then makes nonsense of the following section, since the *Dhātu-pāṭha* is the first of the *khilas*.

IV. ' The Book on the Three Khilas '

I-ching carefully explains that *khila* 棄擲 *khi`-lâ'* means ' waste land ', *huang* 荒; but he is apparently unaware that the word is also used in Sanskrit in the transferred sense of ' appendix, supplement '.

The first of the three *khilas*, in I-ching's account, is the *aṣṭadhātu* 頡瑟吒馱覩 *²ât-ṣït-ṭa-dâ-tou'*. Here we expect the *Dhātu-pāṭha*; but this has already been mentioned in the preceding section, and the contents of the *aṣṭadhātu* cannot have any connexion with the *Dhātu-pāṭha*. The present ' *dhātu* ', according to I-ching, deals with the cases of the noun, the moods and tenses of the verb, and the personal endings of the verb. This is not the description of a *khila*, but of a grammar, and in this context is presumably meant as an account of Pāṇini's grammar, even if a very superficial summary. It is thus probable that, in writing his book, I-ching had confused the order of his notes, and that the preceding ' Book on Dhātu ', which is correctly the first of the *khilas*, has been accidentally transposed with the *aṣṭadhātu*. The element *-dhātu* could have contributed to the transposition. On this hypothesis, everything falls into place. The *Dhātu-pāṭha* (in ten sections, after all, not eight) takes its place as the first of the *khilas*; and the *aṣṭadhātu*, with the discussion of what I-ching learnt of its contents from his Indian informants, then concludes his section on Pāṇini's *sūtras*, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

If our only Chinese information had been from I-ching, we should have been tempted to think that his *aṣṭadhātu* was a simple corruption of *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. But Hsüan-tsang's account confirms I-ching here. While the latter transliterated the Sanskrit term, Hsüan-tsang gave a Chinese translation, 八界論.[10] Stanislas Julien's version,[11] ' Il existe un Traité des huit limites (terminations) en huit cents ślokas ', is due to the fact that it was not then realized that *chieh* 界 is regularly used to translate *dhātu* in Buddhist contexts (though not in the grammatical sense of ' verbal root ').

[10] *T*, L, 239 *a*; Beal, *Life*, 122.

[11] *Vie*, 166, quoted by Takakusu, p. 172, n. Presumably Julien thought that the term referred to the case-endings (' terminations '); but the Chinese word would be weird in such a sense.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

We are thus compelled to accept *Aṣṭadhātu* as the title of a Sanskrit grammar: a synonym for *Aṣṭādhyāyī* current in the seventh century.[12] This is surprising. Neither the Sanskrit *dhātu* nor Classical Chinese *chieh* can be cited in the sense of ' chapter, division of a book ', nor does there seem to be any extant attestation of the name *Aṣṭadhātu* in Sanskrit grammatical literature. Nevertheless, the Chinese evidence is strong, and provides a new meaning for *aṣṭadhātu* in the Sanskrit lexicon. This name may then be understood to mean ' (the book) consisting of eight constituent parts '. This would then not conflict too badly with Hsüan-tsang's 八界, where the sense of *chieh* can be understood in a manner reasonably in accord with Buddhist Chinese usage. Compare also p. 254, n. 26, below, on Hsüan-tsang's use of *yüan* for *pratyaya*.

There remain several unresolved problems in the present section. ' These forms of a noun are also distinguished as the heavy and light (probably " accented and unaccented ").' This translation does not make sense in relation to Sanskrit grammar. The terms 重 *guru* and 輕 *laghu* would be expected to apply to Sanskrit prosody, where a metrically ' long ' syllable is *guru* ' heavy ', and a metrically short is *laghu* ' light '.[13] It is possible that I-ching here intends to refer to the so-called ' strong ' and ' weak ' cases of the athematic nominal declensions; but this remains conjectural.

On the personal endings of the verb, I-ching writes: 明上中下尊卑彼此之別. Here Takakusu paraphrases: ' These are the forms of the first, second, and third person (*of the three numbers of a verb*), showing the differences *of the worthy and unworthy, or this and that* '.[14] It seems barely possible to follow Takakusu's hesitant suggestion, which requires taking *tz'ŭ* 此 ' this (person) ' as *ātmane(pada)*, and *pi* 彼 ' that (person) ' as *parasmai(pada)*. On the other hand, *tsun-pei* 尊卑 ' honourable ' and ' humble ' can readily be understood as an attempt to convey to Chinese readers the contrast of second

[12] The fact that the *Aṣṭadhātu* appears in the ' Biography ' (*T*, L, 239 *a*; Beal, *Life*, 122), not in the *Hsi-yü chi*, and is given 800 *ślokas*, is not a serious stumbling-block. The compilers of the ' Biography ' must have derived their information from Hsüan-tsang himself, and the agreement with I-ching guarantees the name *Aṣṭadhātu*. In many other respects, the ' Biography ' shows much confusion. Thus, Pāṇini's grammar, ' the work at present used in India ', is allocated 8,000 *ślokas*, while a few sentences later an ' abbreviated ' grammar in 1,000 *ślokas* is mentioned. Such figures for the length of works are not to be taken too seriously. On the other hand, the *Hsi-yü chi* (*T*, LI, 881 *c*) states that Pāṇini, with the aid of Maheśvara, produced his grammar in 1,000 *ślokas*, thus agreeing with I-ching's figure. Takakusu (p. 172, n.) calculated the length of Pāṇini's Sanskrit text at about 956 *ślokas*.

[13] Pāṇini 1.4.10–12.

[14] The italics in the last phrase presumably indicate doubt on Takakusu's part. In a footnote (p. 174) he adds, ' We should expect here " Ātmanepada and Parasmaipada ". " This and that " may be a vague way of expressing the grammatical terms " Ātmane " and " Parasmai ", for Chinese has no grammatical terms for these. Still, " worthy and unworthy " is very strange '. It should also be remarked that, while Takakusu is certainly correct in giving *uttama*, *madhyama*, and *prathama* as the three persons of the verb in I-ching's intention (cf. Pāṇ. 1.4.105–8), it is not strictly true to say ' literally '. In fact, I-ching has mistranslated *uttama* as ' upper ' (instead of ' last '), and has consequently been led to balance this by ' lower ' for *prathama* (literally ' first ', but corresponding to the third person in European terminology).

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and first person. It is then tempting to understand *pi-tz'ŭ* as indicating the third person; and since I-ching is describing an Indo-European language, it remains just possible that this was his intention. But the regular use in Chinese of *pi-tz'ŭ* in a strongly contrastive sense ('the further and the nearer'; even 'meum et tuum') makes it more likely that the phrase expresses the relative position of the speakers in a discussion, and hence simply the distinctions of the persons of the verb in general terms.

I-ching's remaining two *khilas* are *wen-ch'a* 文 茶 *mi̯uən-ḍa* (interpreted by Takakusu as *maṇḍa* or *muṇḍa*), and *uṇādi* 鄔 拏 地 *ʔou-ṇa-di*`. Coming as it does between the *Dhātu-pāṭha* and the *Uṇādi-sūtra*, the mysterious *wen-ch'a* must represent the *Gaṇa-pāṭha*, even although I-ching's remarks about it show that he did not understand its nature. Mochizuki[15] already made this identification; but his use of the form *maṇḍa* shows that this was merely a deduction from context, although a correct one. It now seems possible to add supporting evidence.

First, the restitution '*maṇḍa*' is to be rejected. Probably it was due to the use of the same character in the common transcription of the name *Mañjuśrī* 文 殊 師 利 *mi̯uən-ʃ̌ou-ṣi-li*`. This, however, does not represent the Sanskrit form, but is equivalent to a North-western Prakrit *\*muṃjuṣ(i)ri*,[16] transmitted through Central Asia. Later, a Chinese transcription direct from Sanskrit was produced, 曼 殊 室 利 *mân-ʃ̌ou-śit-li*`. Earlier scholars in the modern period cannot be blamed for assuming that 文 transcribed the first syllable of the Sanskrit form *Mañjuśrī*. But it is now known that the rhymes *-uən*, *-i̯uən* are normally used for foreign *-un*.[17]

As Takakusu saw, this term is confirmed by Hsüan-tsang's '*Men-tsĕ-kia* (*Maṇḍaka*?)'.[18] The original is 聞 擇 迦[19] *mi̯uən-ḍak-ki̯â*, i.e., Sanskrit *muṇḍaka*.

The word *muṇḍa(ka)* 'shorn, lopped' does not seem to be attested as a

[15] Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, v, 4288 *c*, s.v. *bikara-ron*: 'maṇḍa ... or gaṇapāṭha'. In III, 2778 *c*, s.v. *shōmyō* 聲 明, however, he gives only '*maṇḍa* or *muṇḍa*'. In both entries, he relies mainly on I-ching and Hsüan-tsang, and in the article *shōmyō* quotes in Japanese translation a part of the present chapter from I-ching.

[16] As is shown by the Chinese *-ṣi-* instead of *-śi-*, this is a compromise between a possible Gāndhārī form **muṃjuṣi* and the Sanskrit *-śrī*. G *ṣ* < *śr* is well known: *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, p. 103. For the first part of the name, cf. the alternation *miṃjukrita*, *muṃjukrita*, both probably for *mañju-*: ibid., p. 84; *CII*, II, pp. 98–9. Khotanese has *maṃjuśrī*, *mijāśūrī*, and other spellings: H. W. Bailey, *BSOAS*, x, 4, 1942, 910. The Sogdian evidence is secondary, being translated from the Chinese, but reflects *-u-* in Chinese for the Prakritic form by *mwnč(w)šry* beside *mnč'w-*: D. N. MacKenzie, 'Buddhist terminology in Sogdian: a glossary', *AM*, NS, XVII, 1, 1971, 50, 51.

[17] E. G. Pulleyblank, *AM*, NS, IX, 1, 1962, 81. Similarly the well-known 佛 陀 *bi̯uət-dâ* for *buddha*.

[18] So transcribed by Julien, *Vie*, 166, 470, and given by Takakusu, p. 173, n., as 'Maṇḍaka or Muṇḍaka or Mantaka'.

[19] *T*, L, 239 *a*, where the first character appears as 間 (misprint, or corruption?), with a variant 門 *muən* in a footnote. This last could have been the reading in the edition translated by Julien. Mochizuki, loc. cit., has 聞.

This content downloaded from 142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

technical term in Indian grammatical literature. The clue to its meaning here is provided by Haradatta Miśra's sub-commentary *Padamañjarī* on the *Kāśikā* on Pāṇini 1.3.2 *upadeśe 'j anunāsika it* ' A nasalized [20] vowel in the instruction (has the technical name) *it* '. The *Kāśikā* explains: *upadeśaḥ śāstravākyāni sūtrapāṭhaḥ khilapāṭhaś ca* ' " Instruction " means the statements of the *śāstra*, namely, the text of the *sūtras* and the text of the *khilas* '. The *Padamañjarī* then lists three *khilas* (omitting the *uṇādi*): *dhātupāṭhaḥ*, *prātipadikapāṭhaḥ*, and *vākyapāṭhaḥ*, the last-mentioned being the *Vārttikas* ascribed to Kātyāyana, embedded in the *Mahābhāṣya*.[21] Thus, the term *prātipadikapāṭha* is here used for the *Gaṇa-pāṭha*. If confirmation is needed, Haradatta supplies this in his examples: *dhātuṣv edhādyakāraḥ* ' In the *Dhātu-pāṭha*, the *-a* in *edha*,[22] etc., (is an *it*) ' ; *vākye galbhādyakāraḥ* ' in the *Vārttikas*, the (final) *-a* in *galbha*,[23] etc., (is an *it*) ' ; and, the important one for our purpose, *prātipadikeṣu bhavacchabdasyokāraḥ* ' among the (list of) stem-forms, the *-u* in the word *bhavat-* (is an *it*) '. The item in question appears in the text of the *Gaṇa-pāṭha* as *bhavatu* [24]—not the imperative of *bhū-*, but the honorific *bhavat-*, with the *-u* (*ugit*, Pāṇ. 7.1.70) indicating that the word has *-n-* in the ' strong ' forms: *bhavantam*, etc.

A *prātipadika*, defined by Pāṇ. 1.2.45, 46. is, practically speaking, a ' nominal stem ', before the addition of inflexional endings. It is a fact that by far the greater part of the text of the *Gaṇa-pāṭha* has been transmitted in the form of lists of stems, without case-endings.[25] Haradatta's designation *prātipadikapāṭha* is thus appropriate. And, since a *prātipadika* is a stem ' shorn ' of any inflexional ending, it is evident that the *muṇḍa(ka)* of our Chinese informants is an alternative name (or nickname) current in the seventh century for the *Gaṇa-pāṭha*.

I-ching's brief remarks, however, suffice to indicate that he did not understand the nature of the *Gaṇa-pāṭha*. According to Takakusu, the *Muṇḍa* ' treats of the formation of words by means of combining (a root and a suffix or suffixes) ': 文茶則合成字體. More literally, ' The *Muṇḍa* completes

[20] On this unwritten nasalization, see the Sanskrit grammatical commentaries. The point is not relevant here. It is interesting (though doubtless not significant) that, apart from the present *sūtra*, Pāṇini normally uses the term *upadeśa* to refer only to the *Dhātu-pāṭha*: 8.4.14 and 18, etc.

[21] The term *vākya* is often used instead of *vārttika* in Bhartṛhari's commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*: see Kielhorn's edition, II, introd., p. 22, n. Whether or not the two terms are synonyms, or imply a contrast in type or in authorship, is a problem which I have not investigated.

[22] *edha vṛddhau* is the first item in *Dhātu-pāṭha* I after *bhū*.

[23] The reference is to *vārttika* 3 on Pāṇini 3.1.11 (*Mbh.*, ed. Kielhorn, II, 21), *ācāre galbhaklība-hoḍebhyaḥ kvib vā*.

[24] In Böhtlingk's edition, *gaṇa* 241, 28. Haradatta's apparently random choice of *bhavat(u)* is probably due to the rarity of vocalic *it*-elements in the *Gaṇa-pāṭha*.

[25] There are a few exceptions, e.g., *gaṇa* 73 *gavāśvaprabhṛtīni* (neuter *dvandvas*), 242 *savanādayaḥ*. Feminine forms in *-ā* and *-ī*, although identical in shape with the nom. sg. fem., are to be understood also as stem-forms. Strictly, such feminines are not *prātipadikas* (Pāṇ. 4.1.1), but they are still stems (*prakṛti*) before the case-endings are added; and by a *jñāpaka* from 4.1.1 they may reasonably be held to be included here under the title *prātipadikapāṭha*.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

word-forms ', or perhaps ' word-stems '.[26] The Taishō edition (by placing the *kaeriten* ' 2 ' after 合) prescribes the reading *jitai wo awashite nasu* ' achieves word-forms by combining them '. Ono (p. 374) tries to improve on this by reading *awashite jitai wo nasu nari* ' . . . by combining (presumably root, suffix, and inflexional ending) achieves word-forms '. This would appear to go beyond the sense of the original Chinese; but it must be confessed that I-ching's laconic remark is by no means clear. Moreover, the sentence which follows shows that I-ching is not writing about the *Gaṇa-pāṭha* at all, but about the application of Pāṇini's *sūtras* to an *uṇādi*-word.[27] This is not surprising, since his summary statement a few lines later, that the *Uṇādi* is, by and large, similar to the *Muṇḍa*, tells us that he was unable to discriminate between the two texts. The Chinese here continues: 且如樹之一目。梵云苾力叉。便引二十餘句經文。共相雜糅。方成一事之號也. This Takakusu translates: ' For instance, one of the many names for " tree " in Sanskrit is Vṛkṣa. Thus a name for a thing or matter is formed by joining (the syllables) together, according to the rules of the Sūtra, which consist of more than twenty verses '. This cannot be correct. The word *chü* 句 does not mean ' verse ' here, but is a classifier for *ching-wen* 經文, *sūtra* in the sense of a Pāṇinean rule. I-ching is saying, in effect, ' Consider, for example, " tree ", in Sanskrit, *vṛkṣa*. Now, (in order to form this word), one must cite more than twenty *sūtra*-rules, and taking together all these miscellaneous items, one then finally completes the name of the single thing '.

Even to-day, Indian grammatical pandits are trained to exercise their knowledge by citing all the relevant *sūtras* required for the justification of the correct form of a given word. The word *vṛkṣaḥ* is derived by the *Uṇādi-sūtra* from the root *vraśc-* ' to cut ': a curious but understandably human etymological phantasy: a tree is ' something which one cuts down '. I-ching's statement that ' twenty or so *sūtras* ' are required to justify the final form shows beyond doubt that an Indian grammarian must have explained to him how such things are operated. For *vṛkṣaḥ*, consider the following.

(*a*) *Uṇādi* 3.62 (. . . *saḥ*), and 3.66 (. . . *kit*): *vraśc-* takes the suffix *-sa*, and *kit* (to form the word *vṛkṣa*).

[26] It is impossible to ascertain exactly what I-ching intended here by *tzŭ-t'i* 字體. As noted above, p. 249, the ' Biography ' of Hsüan-tsang at one point uses the term in the sense of *akṣara*, a character of the Sanskrit script. But a few lines later, the same text (*T*, L, 239 *a*) uses the same term several times in contrast to *tzŭ-yüan* 字緣. The latter is a good example of Hsüan-tsang's almost Tibetan-like attitude in the translation of technical terms: for *yüan* was already established as a translation of *pratyaya* ' cause, etc.' in philosophical contexts. Thus Hsüan-tsang has boldly formed the compound *tzŭ-yüan* to translate *pratyaya* ' suffix '. The most probable sense for *tzŭ-t'i* in the ' Biography ' would thus be *prakṛti* ' word-stem '. If we accept *Aṣṭadhātu* as the name of Pāṇini's grammar, the description given there would then fit admirably: 此中略合字之緣體 ' In this (*Aṣṭadhātu*) (the author) briefly combines word-suffixes and word-stems ', i.e., the grammar gives ' briefly ' [in *sūtra*-style] rules for the combination of stems and suffixes.

[27] The word *vṛkṣa* occurs several times in the *Gaṇa-pāṭha*, but I-ching's account seems to make sense only in relation to the *Uṇādi*.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

(*b*) *Dhātu-pāṭha* 6.11 *vrascu chedane*: the root *vrasc-* in the sense of ' cutting '. *Sūtras* can be cited to explain the function of the *it*-element *-u* (*udit*), but this is not relevant to *vṛkṣa*.

(*c*) Pāṇ. 8.4.40 $s > ś$ before c: hence *vrasc-* > *vraśc-*.

(*d*) P 1.1.45, definition of *samprasāraṇa*: here only $ra > ṛ$ is relevant.

(*e*) P 6.1.13, prescription of *samprasāraṇa*.

(*f*) P 6.1.16 and 17, *vraśc-* has *samprasāraṇa* before a *kit*-suffix. Since *-sa* is not itself *kit*, the latter is added by the *Uṇādi* (see (*a*)).

We have now attained **vṛśc-sa*.

(*g*) P 1.1.60, definition of *lopaḥ* ' elision '.

(*h*) P 8.2.23, prescription of *lopaḥ* in certain formations.

(*i*) P 8.2.29, elision of *s* (in certain conditions) when it is the first member of a conjunct: hence *vrasc-* in the *Dhātu-pāṭha* here becomes *vrac-*.

(*k*) P 8.2.30, $c > k$ before (most) suffixes beginning with a consonant: hence **vrak-*.

Combining this with (*a*)–(*f*), we arrive at **vṛk-sa*.

(*l*) P 8.3.55 and 57, $s > ṣ$ . . . after a velar: hence *vṛk-ṣa*.

Having now achieved the stem (*prātipadika*) *vṛkṣa-*, we must cite P 4.1.2 and many related rules in order to supply the correct inflexional endings, and so obtain a *pada*, a ' completed word ': *vṛkṣaḥ*, *vṛkṣau*, etc. This will certainly bring us to more than 20 rules, if we include also all the *sūtras* needed to prescribe instr. pl. *-aiḥ* in place of *-bhiḥ*, gen. pl. *-ānām* in place of *-ām*, *-āṇām* for *-ānām* (because of the preceding *-ṣ-*), and more besides.

The above account does not claim to be complete; but as an illustration, it should suffice to show how puzzling I-ching must have found the system, and to explain why he cast merely a glance at the problem of why it should take more than 20 *sūtras* to construct a single word.

V. ' The Vṛtti-sūtra (Kāśikāvṛtti) '

悉栗底蘇咀羅 *bit-lit-tei'-sou-tât-lâ*. Here we have the worst confusion in the chapter. I-ching himself does not directly mention the *Kāśikā*, and the identification rests on the ascription of the work to Jayāditya 闍耶昳底 *ǰa-ʿi̯a-det-tei'*, ' Jayāditi '.[28] Max Müller provided some entertaining remarks on the subject[29]: ' The name Vṛtti-sūtra is strange. We expect Sūtra-vṛtti '; and ' Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, as taught in I-tsing's time ' was ' a commentary on the Kāśikā arrangement of the Sūtras of Pāṇini '. These early curiosities need no detailed discussion.

H. Oldenberg,[30] in his review of Takakusu's translation, already suggested

[28] But perhaps a final *-ya* has been lost in the transmission of the text.

[29] Introduction to Takakusu's translation, p. xiv, where Kielhorn's remarks (see below, p. 256, n. 31) were referred to in a footnote, but obviously without understanding.

[30] *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1897, 532.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

that I-ching had confounded the ' Vṛttisūtra des Jayāditya, d.h. [die] Kāśikā ', with the *Vārttikas* of Kātyāyana. This is certainly correct in principle: I-ching is indeed attempting to give an account of the *Vārttikas*, though there was still no justification for accepting the term *vṛtti-sūtra* as a designation of the *Kāśikā-vṛtti*.

While Oldenberg was right in rejecting the *Kāśikā* here, the unfortunate I-ching was involved in a still further confusion. As Kielhorn observed,[31] the term *vṛtti-sūtra* does not mean the *Vārttikas*, but is used in the *Mahābhāṣya* in direct contrast: on *vārrt.* 23 to Pāṇ. 2.1.1 (Kielhorn, I, 371), *na brūmo vṛttisūtraprāmāṇyād iti: kiṃ tarhi: vārttikavacanaprāmāṇyād iti* ' We do not say that this rests on the authority of the *vṛtti-sūtra*, but rather on the authority of the statement of the *vārttika* '. Similarly, on Pāṇ. 2.2.24, *vārtt.* 18 (Kielhorn, I, 424). In each case the *vṛtti-sūtra* under consideration is cited in the *Mahābhāṣya*, and is a *sūtra* of Pāṇini's grammar. The term *vṛtti-sūtra* is thus an archaic term for what might later have been called *mūla-sūtra* or such like. This early usage immediately explains the term *vārttika*, although the reason for the use of the term *vṛtti-* here remains obscure.[32] (Obviously, it cannot mean ' commentary ' in this context.)

Thus, I-ching has made the double mistake of using *vṛtti-sūtra* for the *Vārttikas*, and of ascribing the text to Jayāditya, joint author with Vāmana of the (*Kāśikā-*)*vṛtti*. Contextually, as Oldenberg saw, the *Vārttikas* must be intended. But more: I-ching's ' *Vṛtti-sūtra* of Jayāditya ' is a commentary on Pāṇini, afterwards itself commented on by the *Cūrṇi* (*Mahābhāṣya*), which in its turn was provided with a sub-sub-commentary by Bhartṛhari. It is surprising that neither Takakusu nor Max Müller saw one obvious difficulty here: for Jayāditya is stated to have died about 30 years before, and Bhartṛhari some 40 years before I-ching wrote his own work. In theory, it may not be impossible that the sub-sub-commentator should have predeceased the author of the primary commentary by ten years; but it is improbable. We now know that I-ching's date for the death of the grammarian Bhartṛhari is wrong (see below); and we cannot avoid the suspicion that his date for Jayāditya's death may also be untrustworthy. It remains possible that the Jayāditya in question is one of the authors of the *Kāśikā*; but we can have little faith in the date, in spite of its general acceptance by modern scholars.[33]

[31] *Mahābhāṣya*, II, introd., p. 22, n. *Hōbōgirin*, s.v. *bigara*, while giving a useful collection of bibliographical references, renders the term *vṛttisūtra* as ' les sūtra développés '; but this surprising translation is wide of the mark.

[32] It need hardly be said that there is no reason to suppose that *vṛttisūtra* is a ' back-formation ' from *vārttika*.

[33] E. Chavannes, *RHR*, XXXV, 1897, 352, also doubted, but on somewhat different grounds: ' . . . nous ne sommes pas tout à fait certains, si j'en crois les indianistes, que le *Vṛtti-sûtra* fût identique à la *Kâçikâvṛtti*, ni que, par conséquent, le Jayâditya mort en 661 ou 662 fût celui qui est parfois cité comme l'auteur de la *Kâçikâvṛtti* '. As an argument, this seems rather less than cogent; and it seems better to base any doubt upon I-ching's unpredictable reliability on any single point where we have no supporting evidence.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

At best, we have a *terminus ante quem*, together with a reasonable assumption that the *Kāśikā* is later than Bhartṛhari, since in its comment on Pāṇ. 4.3.88 it gives *vākyapadīyam* as an example of the formation of book-titles.

On the '*vṛtti-sūtra*', I-ching remarks: 演其經本詳談衆義。盡寰中之規矩。極天人之軌則. Takakusu translates: 'It cites the text of the Sūtra, and explains its manifold meaning. . . . It exposes the laws of the universe, and the regulations of gods and men'. He adds in a footnote, 'The "Laws of all that is within the universe" seems curious as said of a grammar, and this is not the case with the Kāśikā'. Nor is it the case with the *Vārttikas*; nor do the latter 'cite' the text of the *sūtras*. But it is characteristic of the *Vārttikas* that they frequently add further points and corrections to the *sūtras*: . . . *upasaṃkhyānam* '(The *sūtra* in question requires) the addition of . . .'; and . . . *pratiṣedhaḥ* '(The *sūtra* in question requires an explicit) prohibition of . . .'. In many places, a succession of *vārttikas* is argumentative. It is therefore very probable that the word *yen* 演 has here the sense of 'to extend, expand', and that we should translate, 'It supplements its *sūtra*-text, and discusses in detail numerous (possible) interpretations'. This would be an excellent description of the *Vārttikas*.

It seems likely, however, that I-ching was unable to discriminate between the *Vārttikas* and the *Mahābhāṣya*: witness his statement that the '*vṛtti-sūtra*' consists of 18,000 *ślokas*; and the second part of the Chinese passage quoted makes sense if I-ching is basing it on the opening lines of the *Mahābhāṣya*: *keṣāṃ śabdānām: laukikānāṃ vaidikānāṃ ca* 'Of what words (does the grammar treat)? Of those current in the world, and those of the *Vedas*'. We may then render the Chinese as: 'It discusses fully the (grammatical) usages current in the world,[34] and investigates the rules of (the language addressed to) the gods'.[35]

VI. 'The Cūrṇi'

Cūrṇǐ 'commentary' is among grammarians The Commentary: the *Mahābhāṣya*. Although I-ching states that it contains 24,000 *ślokas*, this discrepancy is not enough to dispel the suspicion, raised in our preceding paragraph, that he failed to distinguish clearly between this text and the *Vārttikas* embedded in it. As he says, 'It is a work of the learned Patañjali. This, again, cites the former Sūtras (Pāṇini)'. Here the word translated as 'cites' is *hsien* 顯, in contrast to *yen* 演 used of the '*vṛtti-sūtra*'.

It should be noted that I-ching's transcription of the name of the work is given by Takakusu in its Sanskrit form *cūrṇi*. But I-ching wrote 朱儞

[34] 'Universe' seems unnecessarily wide for *huan-chung* 寰中.

[35] *t'ien-jen* 天人 is simply 'gods' here. It is possible that I-ching misread *vaidikānāṃ* as *daivikānāṃ*; but such a conjecture is unnecessary.

This content downloaded from 142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

čou-ni',[36] which demonstrates that the word which he heard was not *cūrṇi*, but the Prakrit equivalent *cunni*.

This is of some importance for the historical phonology of Indo-Aryan. It is well known that many Jaina texts fluctuate in spelling between *-ṇṇ-* and *-nn-* in Prakrit words where the Sanskrit etymon, with *-rṇ-*, would lead us to expect only the retroflex *-ṇṇ-*.[37] It is also known that almost all the modern Indo-Aryan languages have the dental nasal in such words: Skt. *cūrṇa-* > Hindi *cūn* 'powder, flour'; Skt. *cūrṇita-* > Hindi, Bengali *cūnī* 'coarsely ground pulse'.[38] Although many of the Prakrit texts are reasonably old, the extant manuscripts are mostly much more recent copies. A doubt is thus possible that such words may not represent an authentic dental *-nn-* belonging to their date of composition. I-ching's transcription of Middle Indian *cunni* is thus a useful independent attestation of the dental already in the seventh century.

It should be added that the name of the author appears with a final *-la*, not *-li*: 鉢顛社擺 *pât-ten-ǰa'-lâ'*. This has apparently arisen from a confusion between the name of the author, Patañjali, and a designation of his work: I-ching must have heard some such form as *Pātañjala-bhāṣya*.

VII. 'The Bhartṛhari-śāstra'

VIII. 'The Vākya-discourse'

IX. 'The Pei-na'

The '*Bhartṛhari-śāstra*', being a commentary on the foregoing *Mahābhāṣya*, is naturally mentioned here first. All three are the works of 伐致[揵]呵利 *bịât-ṭị`-χâ-li`*, Bhaṭṭihari. Here also I-ching shows by his transcription that he heard a Prakrit form of the name. It should by now be unnecessary to protest

[36] The reading of the second character requires justification. The *Kuang-yün* treats 爾 and 尒 as alternative forms. See also E. G. Pulleyblank, art. cit., 234; Gabelentz, *Chinesische Grammatik*, § 404; Karlgren, *Analytic dictionary*, nos. 13, 14; Morohashi, *Dai Kanwa jiten*, I, nos. 470, 471, 1244. Thus 儞 is an alternative graph for 你, 伱. Morohashi, however, gives for all these three the *kan-on* reading *ji*. This would imply a Middle Chinese palatal initial *ñ-*, and presumably results from interchange with 爾. The dental initial *n-* is nevertheless assured for 你 by the *Kuang-yün*, which spells 乃里 *nəi'-li'*, hence *ni'*. The same character is used by I-ching for the dental *-ni* in the name Pāṇini, 波尼儞 *pâ-ṇi-ni'*, while (probably by sheer accident of copying) Hsüan-tsang's text has transposed the last two syllables: *Hsi-yü chi*, *T*, LI, 881 *c* 波爾[emend to 儞]尼. The 'Biography' has gone astray, and gives a retroflex in both syllables, *T*, L, 239 *a* 波膩尼 *pâ-ṇi`-ṇi*. (This last character has the alternative reading *nei`*, Karlgren, 'Grammata Serica recensa', *BMFEA*, 29, 1957, 563; and in earlier transcriptions it seems to have been used not infrequently for Indian *ni*, especially in initial syllables. In later times, however, the normal contrast was made between 泥 *nei* for Skt. *ni* and 尼 for Skt. *ṇi*. It is thus improbable that the final syllable in the 'Biography' here can be interpreted as dental *ni*.)

[37] R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, § 225; Hargovind Das Sheth, *Pāia-sadda-mahaṇṇavo*, giving *cuṇṇia* and *cunnia*, and similarly regularly throughout. The same fluctuation appears in words where *-ṇṇ-* : *-nn-* represents other conjuncts in Sanskrit.

[38] R. L. Turner, *CDIAL*, 4889, 4897. In the sense of 'lime-plaster', Hi. *cūn*, *cūnā*, Beng. *cūṇ*, *cūṇā*. The peripheral languages seem to have retained the retroflex nasal later than the more central languages, although in most, even where it is still written, it is no longer distinguished from the dental in pronunciation. Many other examples could be cited: ibid., 8339 *pūrṇa-*: Hi. *pūn*, Panjabi *punnā*.

This content downloaded from 142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

again about the mechanical, and usually wrong, rendering of *lun* 論 as *śāstra*; and Takakusu is inconsistent in the following item, where he translates the same *lun* as ' discourse '.

A single manuscript, incomplete and broken, has survived of such a commentary ascribed to Bhartṛhari.[39] The colophons are inconsistent, and the name of the work appears as *Bhartṛhari-ṭīkā*, *Mahābhāṣya-ṭīkā*, and *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā*. Whether correctly or not, Indian tradition continued to ascribe this commentary [40] as well as the other two works to the same Bhartṛhari.[41]

I-ching's date for the death of Bhartṛhari (A.D. 651–2) was shown to be too late, probably by about two centuries, by the discovery of quotations from the *Vākyapadīya* in the writings of Diṅnāga. Here it is sufficient to refer to earlier discussions.[42] It is superfluous to speculate on I-ching's reasons for

[39] V. Swaminathan (ed.), *Mahābhāṣya ṭīkā by Bhartṛhari*, I, Banaras, 1965. This contains *āhnikas* 1–4, and the remaining (incomplete) three *āhnikas* extant in the manuscript are promised for subsequent publication.

[40] Madeleine Biardeau has expressed some doubt about the authenticity of the surviving fragmentary commentary: *Théorie de la connaissance et philosophie de la parole dans le brahmanisme classique*, Paris, 1964, 261–2, although in the end she appears to leave the question open. But V. Swaminathan, ' Bhartṛhari's authorship of the commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* ', *Adyar Library Bulletin*, XXVII, 1–4, 1963, 59 ff., has noted quotations or close paraphrases in Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*, Vardhamāna's *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*, Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*, Annambhaṭṭa's sub-commentary on Kaiyaṭa, and Nāgeśa's *Uddyota* (in the last, thrice *hariṇā*, and once *hari-ṭīkāyām*), all of which are ascribed to Bhartṛhari, and all of which appear in the extant commentary. Thus, from the eleventh century onwards, the latter was certainly considered to be the work of Bhartṛhari; and there is no reason to doubt that it is the same commentary mentioned in the seventh century by I-ching. The onus of proof is thus on those who wish to ascribe the *Mahābhāṣya-ṭīkā* to a different Bhartṛhari. Further, Mlle. Biardeau writes (ibid., 258), ' Le contenu des œuvres de Bhartṛhari tel qu'il nous est indiqué par I-tsing est quelque peu surprenant. D'une part, il évalue tout en *śloka*, même s'il s'agit d'un ouvrage en prose comme le commentaire sur le *Mahābhāṣya* . . .'. This, at least, is not surprising, since from early times, as witnessed by countless manuscript colophons, prose works were regularly measured in *ślokas* ' groups of 32 syllables ' (cf. p. 249, n. 8, above). On p. 259 she continues, ' I-tsing fait état d'un commentaire sur le VP (c'est-à-dire sur les deux premiers *kāṇḍa*) qui aurait 7 000 śloka et serait l'œuvre de Bhartṛhari. Outre que nous ne possédons aucune glose versifiée du VP, . . .'; p. 260, ' Ni l'une ni l'autre n'est versifiée '. One may argue on other grounds, as Mlle. Biardeau herself has done in the introduction to her translation of *Vākyapadīya* i, that the commentary on that *kāṇḍa* ascribed to Bhartṛhari by Charudeva Shastri is by a different author; but the fact that it is not in verse is no argument. I-ching may still be telling the truth when he states that Bhartṛhari wrote a commentary (in prose, though I-ching had been given by his informants a measurement in *ślokas*) on *Vākyapadīya* i and ii. Naturally, even if this is true, it does not prove that any surviving commentary is Bhartṛhari's own.

[41] As noted by V. S. Agrawala in his foreword to Swaminathan's edition of the commentary, Vardhamāna in his *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* (mid twelfth century) refers to Bhartṛhari as the author of the *Vākyapadīya*, the *Prakīrṇaka*, and a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* called *Tripādī*. Thus, then as in I-ching's time, the *Prakīrṇaka* was still considered as a separate work.

[42] H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar, ' Bhartṛhari and Diṅnāga ', *JBBRAS*, NS, XXVI, 2, 1951, 147–9; H. Nakamura, ' Tibetan citations of Bhartṛhari's verses and the problem of his date ', *Studies in Indology and Buddhology, presented in honour of Professor S. Yamaguchi*, Kyoto, 1955, 122–36; E. Frauwallner, ' Dignāga, sein Werk und seine Entwicklung ', *WZKSO*, III, 1959, 83–164, especially 146–52. On Bhartṛhari and Buddhism (now really a dead issue), see further D. S. Ruegg, *Contributions à l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne*, Paris, 1959, 57 ff., with detailed references to previous discussions.

This content downloaded from 142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

converting Bhartṛhari into a Buddhist, ' intimately acquainted with the doctrine of " sole knowledge " (Vidyāmātra) '. (Takakusu, p. 179.) The name of this doctrine will doubtless be tacitly emended by most Indologists to *vijñaptimātratā*: if confirmation were needed, the Chinese text has *wei-shih* 唯 識. More troublesome to the Western Indologist is the mention (p. 181) of the philosopher ' Jina ', though a Japanese would probably see at once that this was *Jinna*, the modern pronunciation of the Chinese transliteration of the name Diṅnāga, 陳 那 *ḍin-nâ*. This was already recognized in a review [43] of Takakusu's book, though without awareness that the initial represented an Indian retroflex. We thus have here a further example of what has been called ' spontaneous cerebralization ', perhaps a Prakritic **ḍinnāa*.[44]

In addition to older Indian tradition already mentioned, it has been recognized in modern times that the length of 700 *ślokas* given by I-ching for the *Vākyapadīya* is a reasonable approximation for *kāṇḍas* i and ii together. It follows inevitably that ' *Pei-na* ' [45] is the *Prakīrṇaka*. Rangaswamy Iyengar [46] and Subramania Iyer [47] have already made this proposal, and the latter suggested that the Chinese name might represent a Prakrit *païṇṇa*. Unfortunately (unless Takakusu had a different reading before him), the modern transcription should not be *pei-na*, but *pi-na* 鞞 拏, Mid. Ch. *pit-ṇa*. It is hard to reconcile this with *païṇṇa*. At the same time, it is equally hard to reject the identification. One can only suggest that I-ching misheard the Prakrit name, and that his transcription reflects a distortion, **piṇṇa*. (Note that we have here *-ṇṇ-*, in contrast to *cunni* discussed above.) This is not a very satisfying solution; but no better alternative has yet suggested itself.

While I hope that the present article has cleared a few difficulties, I trust that it will be received chiefly as a plea for the urgency of fresh translations, not only of I-ching, but also of the works of other Chinese Buddhist scholars who wrote of their experiences in India.

[43] T. W[atters], *JRAS*, 1897, 363.

[44] cf. T. Burrow, ' Spontaneous cerebrals in Sanskrit ', *BSOAS*, xxxiv, 3, 1971, 538–59.

[45] It is a pity that Bühler's suggestion, that the Indian word intended here was *beḍa* or *veḍa* ' boat ', was adopted by Takakusu, and has been too often repeated.

[46] op. cit., 147.

[47] K. A. Subramania Iyer, *Bhartṛhari: a study of the Vākyapadīya in the light of the ancient commentaries*, Poona, 1969, 6.

This content downloaded from
142.244.6.156 on Thu, 20 Aug 2026 19:40:54 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms